

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

GREGORY HOLDEN, :  
Petitioner : CIVIL ACTION  
vs. :  
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE :  
COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, ET. AL., :  
Respondents :  
:

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 11th day of July, 2017, upon consideration of the Petition/Motion Under Rule 60(b) (6) Requesting Re-Opening of His Case Based Upon United States Supreme Court Recent Decision Buck v. Davis, 197 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2017) (Doc. No. 21), it is hereby ORDERED that the Petition/Motion is DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE COURT:

s/J. Curtis Joyner  
J. CURTIS JOYNER, J.

---

<sup>1</sup> Following our review of the record in this matter under the lens of Buck v. Davis, 137 S. Ct. 759, 197 L. Ed. 2d 1 (2017), we cannot find that Petitioner either has demonstrated that his case presents such extraordinary circumstances as would warrant Rule 60(b)(6) relief or that his underlying claim has some merit such as would warrant our consideration of his claim that his prior counsel was constitutionally ineffective.